Craig B. Sholley [redacted] June 16, 1997

Dear Craig:

Our telephone conversation was very interesting, all stimulated by Jon Warshovsky's comments in Numismatic News.

At your request I am sending a copy of the draft of your mint machinery article which I have interlineated. It was sent to me by Mark Borchardt at my request. You indicated it may contain changes which you are not yet aware of. Certainly the queries added in the footnotes must be new and require your response as well as footnote renumbering, etc. I hope I will not cause problems by sending this to you at this time. You have produced a gem.

You were going to send me any machinery pictures which you plan to use. There is no need to send any which are in Diderot, Cooper, Ansell or Taxay. Did Doty add anything new in pictures?

The mint machinery illustrations I have uncovered I believe are printed in America, more detailed than others in most respects, accompanied by explanations and much clearer. They are of the Royal Mint and so far as I know are numismatically unknown. I had planned to use them in a separate publication as I told you but because of the quality of your work and the need for better illustrations than used in the Breen half cent book, I am thinking about what to do. I will study whatever you send me.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Craig Sholley [redacted] September 9, 1997

Dear Craig:

I was glad to receive your letter, the greetings from Dick Johnson, news of your Rittenhouse Society breakfast, etc. After my wonderful African adventure I have been doing some thinking and I am going to share with you fully my mint machinery information because I am too overloaded with research and writing and think you are the person to lead and carry on the mint machinery research. I want to participate in whatever is done with the material I have been fortunate enough to locate.

The answer to your question about not finding any anti-clashing or cushioning mechanism is easy. It is in the text to a great extent but can be seen on the side walls where the swinging beam bumps. The text will clear this up.

The data enclosed has been sought by me for years. It was found by serendipity when I was poking in a private library waiting for a friend to finish a telephone conversation.

I was familiar with the first edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica as to coinage and minting. It never occurred to me to look in subsequent editions for revisions. My friend has Supplement to the 4th, 5th, and 6th editions printed in 1824 in London. I saw the article under coinage (pp. 222-249) written by A.A., including Plates LXI, LXII, LXIII, and LXIV dated 1813. I noticed the plates were dated 11 years before the publication date.

Then a year or so later I acquired originals of Plates CC, CCI and CCII engraved by H. Andersen and undated. I realized that there was a revision of plates and therefore must have been a revision of text, but because of the early obsolete mint machinery knew that plates CC etc. were earlier than LXI, etc. in The American Edition of the New Edinburgh Encyclopaedia (Phila. 1815). This text is entitled Coining machinery and is signed J.F. That is as far as I have gone, but I realize there must be many printings prior to the 1815 which may or may not have variances. Some one needs to check the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and perhaps 5th and 6th

Craig Sholley [redacted] September 9, 1997

Dear Craig:

I was glad to receive your letter, the greetings from Dick Johnson, news of your Rittenhouse Society breakfast, etc. After my wonderful African adventure I have been doing some thinking and I am going to share with you fully my mint machinery information because I am too overloaded with research and writing and think you are the person to lead and carry on the mint machinery research. I want to participate in whatever is done with the material I have been fortunate enough to locate.

The answer to your question about not finding any anti-clashing or cushioning mechanism is easy. It is in the text to a great extent but can be seen on the side walls where the swinging beam bumps. The text will clear this up.

The data enclosed has been sought by me for years. It was found by serendipity when I was poking in a private library waiting for a friend to finish a telephone conversation.

I was familiar with the first edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica as to coinage and minting. It never occurred to me to look in subsequent editions for revisions. My friend has Supplement to the 4th, 5th, and 6th editions printed in 1824 in London. I saw the article under coinage (pp. 222-249) written by A.A., including Plates LXI, LXII, LXIII, and LXIV dated 1813. I noticed the plates were dated 11 years before the publication date.

Then a year or so later I acquired originals of Plates CC, CCI and CCII engraved by H. Andersen and undated. I realized that there was a revision of plates and therefore must have been a revision of text, but because of the early obsolete mint machinery knew that plates CC etc. were earlier than LXI, etc. in The American Edition of the New Edinburgh Encyclopaedia (Phila. 1815). This text is entitled Coining machinery and is signed J.F. That is as far as I have gone, but I realize there must be many printings prior to the 1815 which may or may not have variances. Some one needs to check the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and perhaps 5th and 6th

Craig Sholley [redacted] September 29, 1997

Dear Craig:

While I was in Colonial Williamsburg for a numismatic lecture and event, I checked their encyclopaedia holdings. I enclose the article on Coinage from Vol. 5 published in 1798 at Philadelphia with plate CXLIV to which it refers. The description of the 18 volume encyclopaedia is also enclosed. Obviously, the article was written in England and was introduced in America without any American input. It adds nothing new unfortunately.

This still leaves the 1802 Britannica printed in London open for checking.

I hope you can continue to check for similar articles I suggested and which may throw more light or more accurate light on the subject.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Craig Sholley [redacted] May 18, 1999

Dear Craig:

I have read over your January 20, 1999 letter to me concerning the feeding and ejecting mechanisms at the early U.S. Mint. for more times than you can believe. I sincerely appreciate its extensive and considered input. I wanted to respond sooner but was unfortunately side tracked by needed work on the ANS cent theft matter and additional squabbles of others.

You have emphasized the Wailes data in your letter and I have studied his comments further. He was a Mississippi cotton planter on a sight seeing vacation to the East coast and wrote a remarkable description in a pocket notebook of his morning visit to the U.S. Mint with his wife. I have a couple of amendments to suggest for his text. The undecipherable word is scissel, scrap or salvage. The word "rivit" is probably "pivot".

Your explanation for the collar constraining the planchet during striking is very convincing and conforms to the Boulton equipment, but I wonder whether that applies to other than coppers. The silver and gold coinage has lettered or reeded edges which would be harmed (reeded particularly) by the restraint of a collar. The collar would also be unnecessary. Wailes mentions that the planchets are weighed and this could only apply to silver and gold. Wailes making the error about edge designs being put on by a squeezing of the nippers is understandable, but he might have assumed that what happened in copper striking also happened in specie coin striking. I would like your opinion as to whether the mechanism for feeding and ejection would work without a collar for specie as I believe it should when a Castaing machine was first used on the edges of the planchets.

I am now satisfied that the nippers could push the struck coin forward into the chute without much harm, but why were necks of the dies for specie coinage not beveled if no collar was used ? Is it possible that a collar plate for a specie coin would rise by spring action after striking to raise the expanded struck coin off the die to avoid any ejection marring. Your fine work on neck

Craig Sholley [redacted] May 18, 1999

Dear Craig:

I have read over your January 20, 1999 letter to me concerning the feeding and ejecting mechanisms at the early U.S. Mint. for more times than you can believe. I sincerely appreciate its extensive and considered input. I wanted to respond sooner but was unfortunately side tracked by needed work on the ANS cent theft matter and additional squabbles of others.

You have emphasized the Wailes data in your letter and I have studied his comments further. He was a Mississippi cotton planter on a sight seeing vacation to the East coast and wrote a remarkable description in a pocket notebook of his morning visit to the U.S. Mint with his wife. I have a couple of amendments to suggest for his text. The undecipherable word is scissel, scrap or salvage. The word "rivit" is probably "pivot".

Your explanation for the collar constraining the planchet during striking is very convincing and conforms to the Boulton equipment, but I wonder whether that applies to other than coppers. The silver and gold coinage has lettered or reeded edges which would be harmed (reeded particularly) by the restraint of a collar. The collar would also be unnecessary. Wailes mentions that the planchets are weighed and this could only apply to silver and gold. Wailes making the error about edge designs being put on by a squeezing of the nippers is understandable, but he might have assumed that what happened in copper striking also happened in specie coin striking. I would like your opinion as to whether the mechanism for feeding and ejection would work without a collar for specie as I believe it should when a Castaing machine was first used on the edges of the planchets.

I am now satisfied that the nippers could push the struck coin forward into the chute without much harm, but why were necks of the dies for specie coinage not beveled if no collar was used ? Is it possible that a collar plate for a specie coin would rise by spring action after striking to raise the expanded struck coin off the die to avoid any ejection marring. Your fine work on neck

Craig Sholley

[redacted]

August 17, 1999

Dear Craig:

In your last telephone call to me you felt that Breen had introduced the contents of an imaginary letter about the open and close collar matter, I met Bob Julian in Chicago and I mentioned to him that I believe I can explain the confusion.

Breen in his Encyclopedia describes the same matter at least 4 times and does it differently each time (p. 280, col. 2; p. 305, col. 1 & 2; p. 343, col. 2; & p. 390, col. 2). The July 4, 1829 date is the corner stone dedication, not the date of the November 8, 1836 letter, etc.

I hope this is helpful. We missed you.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

cc: Bob Julian

To: Craig Sholley [redacted] June 5, 2000

From: Eric P. Newman

I appreciate your extensive input on my theoretical design of a possible early feeding and ejecting mechanism. The actual sizes of the planchets, coins, dies, etc. have given me the opportunity to modify my ideas somewhat and still comply with the3 parameters of (1) automatic feeding and ejection, (2) open collar, and (3) die neck diameter the same as die diameter.

I have accordingly entirely eliminated the top section of the previously submitted collar and am using only the central part and the lower part of the collar. The former central part will move to the top of the collar leaving a 180 degree concave cut out, but will have flat wings which will meet the flat wings of the pusher which also has a 180 degree concave cut out on the pushing end. The former lower part of the collar being a 360-degree ring around the die neck will be directly below the open collar part. The slide path will be full width. The only major change in procedure is that the struck coin will not be lifted off of the lower die but will be swept, brushed or pushed off the die by a sweeper which is automatic and may be separately activated by the screwpress rather than be on the front of the pusher. The sweeper must operate immediately after the striking and before the open collar rises. No part of the 360-degree lower collar ever rises above the level of the underside of the slide path or the lower die face. As changed the revised mechanism will be much simpler and much more open. It is easy to machine, uses the die neck easily and justifies the open collar name. It will accommodate lettered edge or plain edge pieces without deforming them. It will usually produce coins very slightly off center because there will be a tiny bit of space between the collar diameter and the planchet diameter in various directions, the die being slightly larger than the planchet. Thus the struck coin will have its dentils of slightly different length in different parts of the perimeter as the coins actually do.

Now you can straighten me out again. Perhaps this time I have passed the test. You may wish to draw this concept if it is a realistic possibility.

To: Mr. Craig Sholley [redacted] June 20, 2000

From: Eric P. Newman

The beautiful U.S. Mint Steam Coinage Press has given birth to a gem and I thank you for sending me one. It will be put next to my original of the token struck from the same machinery long ago. You and the Gallery Mint experts must have had fun bringing the mechanism back to life.

I am patiently awaiting your drawings or comments on the last draft of the feeding mechanism for the pre-1815 screw presses. How can I come up with new ideas unless you make me junk the old ones? It's fun to work with you.

My sincere appreciation.

To: Craig Sholley January 8, 2001

From: Eric P. Newman

Re: Strawberry Leaf U.S. Cents

In this last millennium you sent me a 5 page article you wrote entitled "The Strawberry Leaf Cents-Real or Counterfeit?" This followed a telephone conversation this Christmas in which you asked me to obtain the diameters of the Strawberry Leaf Cent owned by ANS. I requested those measurements for you immediately.

You and Holmes permitted me to see the Holmes pieces at the Philadelphia ANA Convention and I was appreciative. I concluded that the edges were decorated as on other vine and bars 1793 cents and as I expressed to Kleeberg long ago I feel that no one would counterfeit a copper coin for circulation and put a decorated edge on it. I never used the word "counterfeit" to you or to anyone else as to the Strawberry Leaf cents. I stated that they might be 19th century alterations of genuine cents. I took no position and yet you state "Eric's argument fails on several points." I did not say that fusing could have taken place but mentioned that expert tooling could have been done. Added material would ordinarily show up in an x-ray. Smith of Ann Street alterations of 1793 cents about 1860 are tooled gorgeously and metal was moved (possibly using heat) into different positions and shapes. I did not comment upon tooling of rare varieties as compared to tooling more common varieties.

You are and must feel free to write whatever you wish as long as it is sincere. All I am doing is pointing out what I said. I have never expressed or written any opinion on the pieces, but am happy to discuss research thoughts with you or anyone working on a topic. We have a fine relationship and it will stay that way. Differences of opinion on hanging chad or otherwise are normal. Keep up the good work as solutions to complex problems are often elusive. Ain't we got fun?